



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,896	12/29/2003	Ki Chang Kim	11037-199-999	6936
24341	7590	08/30/2004	EXAMINER	
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP. 2 PALO ALTO SQUARE 3000 EL CAMINO REAL PALO ALTO, CA 94306			GUTMAN, HILARY L	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3612		

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/747,896	KIM, KI CHANG
	Examiner Hilary Gutman	Art Unit 3612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 8 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4, 6 and 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/29/03</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because in Figure 6, number "115" should be "113". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 413. Corrected

drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to a foreign application or patent, or to a publication is improper. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to include the material incorporated by reference. The amendment must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration executed by the applicant, or a practitioner representing the applicant, stating that the amendatory material consists of the same material incorporated by reference in the referencing application. See *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 179 USPQ 157 (CCPA 1973); *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 579, 179 USPQ 163 (CCPA 1973); and *In re Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 577, 179 USPQ 167 (CCPA 1973).

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 4, [0023], lines 1 and 2, “15” should be “115”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the vertical portion" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 8-9, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KR '641 in view of Takahashi et al.

KR 1998-059641 discloses a shipping hook assembly comprising: a mounting unit 1 (Figure 3) that is coupled to a vehicle body (Figure 1); and a shipping hook 51 with a vertical supporting member 51 that is coupled to a side portion of the mounting unit and a horizontal supporting member (generally at 52) that is coupled to a lower portion of the mounting unit, the shipping hook being coupled to the mounting unit and the vehicle body.

With regard to claim 3, the shipping hook further comprises a connecting portion (Fig. 3) to which the vertical supporting member and the horizontal supporting member are coupled, and a hooking hole 53 is formed in the connecting portion.

With regard to claim 5, the vertical supporting member and horizontal supporting member each have a rectangular plate shape.

With regard to claim 8, a flange 54 is integrally formed in a vertical portion of the shipping hook.

For claim 9, KR '641 discloses a shipping hook assembly comprising: a mounting unit 1 configured and dimensioned to coupled with a vehicle body (Figure 1); and a shipping hook 51 having a vertical supporting member 51 configured and dimensioned to coupled with a side portion of the mounting unit and a horizontal supporting member 52 configured and dimensioned to coupled with a lower portion of the mounting unit.

KR lacks the shipping hook being a front shipping hook.

Takahashi et al. (6,736,449) disclose a front shipping hook 38 attached to a vehicle body.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the shipping hook of KR at the front of the vehicle body as taught by Takahashi et al. in order to tie down the front of the vehicle for better securement thereof.

10. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KR '641, as modified, as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Tomita (6,729,639).

With regard to claim 2, KR '641, as modified, discloses the side portion of the mounting unit formed of two plates and the lower portion of the mounting unit being formed with one plate.

KR '641, as modified, lacks the lower portion of the mounting unit also being formed of two plates.

Tomita teaches a shipping hook assembly comprising: a mounting unit 1, 20 that is coupled to a vehicle body (inherent, but not shown); and a shipping hook 3 with a vertical supporting member 32 that is coupled to a side portion of the mounting unit and a horizontal supporting member 31a that is coupled to a lower portion of the mounting unit, the shipping hook being coupled to the mounting unit and the vehicle body.

With regard to claim 2, the side portion of the mounting unit has two plates 11, 12, and the lower portion of the mounting unit is formed of two plates 10, 21 as well.

With regard to claim 3, the shipping hook further comprises a connecting portion (Fig. 1) to which the vertical supporting member 32 and the horizontal supporting member 31a are coupled, and a hooking hole 3a is formed in the connecting portion.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided an additional plate as taught by Tomita to the lower portion of the mounting unit of KR '641, as modified, in order to add strength and rigidity to the assembly.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 4 and 6-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hilary Gutman whose telephone number is 703-305-0496.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Dayoan can be reached on 703-308-3102. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3612

14. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9326, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 746-3515, (for informal or draft communications, please clearly label

“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”).


Hilary Gutman
August 25, 2004